DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 169 874 HE 011 306

AUTHOR Shulman, Carol Herrnstadt
TITLE Old Expectations, New Realities: The Academic Profession Revisited. AAHE-ERIC/Higher Education Research Report No. 2, 1979.
INSTITUTION American Association for Higher Education, Washington, D.C.; George Washington Univ., Washington, D.C. ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE 79
NOTE 58p.
AVAILABLE FROM Publications Department, American Association for Higher Education, One Dupont Circle, Suite 780, Washington, DC 20036 ($4.00)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Academic Freedom; Collective Bargaining; *College Faculty; Educational Finance; Educational History; Educational Policy; Employment Opportunities; Faculty Mobility; Financial Problems; Governance; *Higher Education; Models; Researchers; Teacher Motivation; *Teacher Role; Teacher Welfare; Tenure; Trend Analysis
IDENTIFIERS *Compensation (Remuneration); *Faculty College Relationship; Information Analysis Products

ABSTRACT

The historical background and characteristics of the academic model, on which modern academic life is based, are presented in this monograph, and changing conditions in higher education that call for reevaluation of the academic model are examined. The model originated with the rise of the university system in the late nineteenth century, which established the faculty's role as researcher and scholar first and teacher second. In the 1970's enrollment and financial problems point up crucial flaws in this model. With the declining job market, faculty job mobility decreased. The impact of the Ph.D. surplus is addressed. A review of the academic reward system for faculty includes: (1) a description of faculty activities and preferences; (2) an analysis of how academic rewards serve faculty needs; and (3) a discussion of efforts to refocus the reward system away from research to teaching. Current conditions in higher education have also resulted in a loss of faculty autonomy, and centralized decision-making and greater reliance on irregular faculty appointments have occurred. Collective bargaining is an option faculty may select to try to improve their position. A bibliography is included. (SW)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

2

REPORT

# Old Expectations, New Realities: The Academic Profession Revisited

Carol Herrnstadt Shulman

ED169874

HE 011 306

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ERIC/AAHE 1979

$4.00

2

# Old Expectations, New Realities
# The Academic Profession Revisited

Carol Herrnstadt Shulman

AAHE-ERIC/Higher Education
Research Report No. 2, 1979

Prepared by the
ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education
The George Washington University
Washington, D.C. 20036

Published by
the American Association for Higher Education
One Dupont Circle, Suite 780
Washington, D.C. 20036

*This publication was prepared pursuant to a contract with the National Institute of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their judgment in professional and technical matters. Prior to publication, the manuscript was submitted to the American Association for Higher Education for critical review and determination of professional competence. This publication has met such standards. Points of view or opinions do not, however, necessarily represent official views or opinions of either the American Association for Higher Education or the National Institute of Education.*

## Already Published in the 1979 Series

1. Women in Academe: Steps to Greater Equality
   *Judith Gappa and Barbara Uehling* — $4.00

*To subscribe to the Research Report series (10 issues starting from date of subscription), write to the Publications Department, American Association for Higher Education, One Dupont Circle, Suite 780, Washington, D.C. 20036. The subscription rate for AAHE members is $25, for nonmembers $35. Payment must accompany all orders under $15.*

# Foreword

Society sets several occupations above all others and grants them the privileged status of being called "professions." The three highest ranked professionals are medical doctors, lawyers, and college professors. Each occupation has a distinctive body of knowledge, requires long and intensive academic preparation, and in the process of being educated, students go through a socialization or professionalization process. It is the latter part of the development of the academic profession that is now in conflict with the changing conditions of higher education and is the focus of this Research Report.

Socialization into a profession consists of a set of experiences that allows an individual to test various values and sets of behavior patterns as s/he works closely with role models, both teachers and peers, during a very intensive training period. The outcome is a person who has internalized an image of the correct ways to act, what career steps to expect, and what the rewards and responsibilities of the profession are. For the academic profession, this image is one that has been developed and reinforced over the past twenty years, which are sometimes referred to as the "Golden Age" of higher education.

The golden age is over but its memory remains. The previously internalized image of what *should* be true of the academic profession no longer seems to hold. Carol Herrnstadt Shulman, a research associate with the ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education, clearly points out how this image of "what should be" is in conflict with reality. The consequence of this conflict is a profession that on the whole is developing high anxiety about the future, doubt about career choices, and defenses that hinder higher education institutions from adapting to the changing social and economic climate.

In this Research Report, Ms. Shulman identifies three major characteristics of the academic model: job mobility, academic reward systems, and faculty autonomy. She then analyzes these characteristics in light of current conditions and makes recommendations on how the academic profession might adapt. This report helps to place in perspective the underlying assumptions of the profession, as faculty review the workplace of higher education and look for opportunities for professional renewal.

Jonathan D. Fife, Director
ERIC® Clearinghouse on Higher Education

# Contents

**Overview** 1
Introduction 5
**The Academic Model** 8
Historical Background 8
Characteristics of the Academic Model 10
Academic Organizations 14
Summary 15
**Faculty Job Mobility** 18
Statistical Information 18
Impact on the PhD Surplus 21
Summary 25
**The Academic Reward System** 26
Faculty Activities/Preferences 26
Rewards 28
Changing the Reward System 33
Coping with the Steady State 23
Summary 34
**Faculty Autonomy** 36
Centralized Decisionmaking 36
"Irregular" Faculty Positions 39
Collective Bargaining 41
Summary 44
**Conclusions** 45
**Bibliography** 47

# Overview

The academic profession reaped enormous benefits from the fifteen-year period of expansion in higher education that began in the late 1950's. Changes occurring in the profession during this time so redefined the concept of a faculty career it was said an "academic revolution" had taken place.

Faculty gains were fourfold. *First,* a faculty career acquired status equivalent to other professions. *Second,* demand for qualified faculty was high. In this sellers' market, academics were virtually guaranteed job mobility within or among institutions. Such mobility gave them the opportunity to develop a satisfying career. *Third,* college faculty won, formally or informally, central roles in academic decisionmaking on many campuses. And *fourth,* seemingly unlimited financial resources available during this period helped to promote and consolidate the preceding achievements.

College and university faculty regard these gains as an integral part of the ideal academic career. But they now find this conception undermined by pressures affecting the higher education community; that is, colleges and universities are experiencing declines in enrollment growth and face straitened financial resources. Forecasts indicate that these problems will continue at a significant level into the twenty-first century.

These new conditions indicate that academic life has changed since its golden period. To understand how faculty are affected by these changes, new developments in the academic profession are discussed in light of the academic model that evolved during the 1960's. This model established professional goals for the majority of currently employed faculty.

The academic model joins together the concepts of "academic profession" with "academic career." In the academic model, professional values determine the stages of the academic career, and are the criteria by which a faculty member's career is measured and advances. "Academic profession" signifies a set of professional values, e.g., autonomy and peer review, that are specifically tailored to the requirements of academic life. "Academic career" applies the career concept to the particular demands of academic life.

Historically, three elements have emerged as essential to the academic model: (1) research is an important endeavor, and the focus of

university life; (2) academic work requires peer judgment, and (3) scholarship is a vocation in its own right. To these, the modern professoriate adds another element: the profession has prestige because it serves important social goals. This component developed after World War II when intellectual, scientific, and scholarly activities became more important; consequently, academic life attracted new recruits from higher social backgrounds.

College faculty develop their academic value systems when they are in graduate school; here, they learn that academics are a professional group, which is defined as "a group that claims the right to regulate itself, determining its own methods and judging its own members." Further, the graduate schools stress the importance of research and loyalty to one's discipline. Graduate departments' professional self-image and their interest in advancing knowledge logically fits in with another central value of the academic model: academic freedom in the conduct of research and in classroom instruction.

Academic career patterns reflect and reinforce this value system. Three "strands" are distinguished in the academic career: disciplinary, institutional, and external. The disciplinary strand is foremost among the three because success in the others depends on the "disciplinary criteria of success."

Within this overall pattern, two qualities make this profession unique: (1) tenure and (2) substantial employment mobility. Academic tenure has long been considered an essential component of the academic career path; mobility is a 1950s addition, standing, somewhat incongruously, with academic tenure and its connotation of permanence.

Unlike other professional groups, faculty are uniquely dependent upon an organizational setting to meet their career goals. The structure and operations of the university are therefore important factors in shaping the academic model. Higher education institutions have been described as operating as "organized anarchies." Such an organizational system contains multiple ambiguities that would seem to enhance faculty power. This system does not offer clear-cut paths to educational or research achievement; thus, autonomy and independent thought are furthered by this method of organization.

The academic model served faculty well throughout the late 1950's and early 1960's. But current problems point up crucial flaws in this model. Lacking sustained growth, the higher education community does not have a personnel policy that maintains traditional faculty values and job satisfaction. Several major aspects of the model are casualties of this failure.

*Academic Job Mobility* — First signs of a declining job market appeared in 1968-69, but were not recognized until the mid-1970's, when the academic community recognized a serious glut in the faculty job market. Recent statistics show virtually no growth in faculty employment through the year 2000. By 1982, the surplus of supply to demand in new doctorates may be more than 16 percent of supply; for 1986, this figure may be over 36 percent; and between 1981 and 1986, an annual surplus of 2,000 new doctorates is anticipated.

Tenure ratios and the age profile are two factors in this gloomy prognosis. First, an already high ratio of tenured to nontenured faculty acts as a barrier to hiring of new tenure-track employees and to promoting faculty to tenure. Second, reports on the faculty age profile show that the vast majority of faculty are in their mid-thirties to mid-forties, reflecting the expansion in hiring that occurred during the past fifteen years.

These approaching employment problems disturb the academic community. The foremost concern is with retaining talented, young Ph.D.'s whose contributions may be lost if they do not find academic employment. Several proposals for coping with this problem are described: *e.g.*, National Science Foundation proposals for sponsoring young science doctorates in academic life, and a program to place humanities Ph.D.'s in business careers, which is partially supported by the National Endowment for the Humanities. Other impacts that have not been widely addressed are the graduate school's role in training new Ph.D.'s for academic or business careers and the impact of no mobility on faculty morale.

*The Academic Reward System*—The academic reward system holds that research is a faculty member's highest duty, teaching is secondary, and effective teaching requires a teacher to be stimulated by his research efforts. This reward system is incongruent with the realities of academic life, where teaching is the major activity of most faculty, even at research-oriented institutions.

Nevertheless, the reward system reflects the values of the academic model. Except at two-year institutions, research is more important in evaluating faculty for rewards — promotion and tenure — than teaching. Thus faculty continually experience dissonance in their careers: they are paid to teach, and many claim to derive their job satisfaction from this activity, but research is the activity that brings career rewards.

Even the rewards granted under the academic model are now questioned. Tenure, the lynchpin of the academic reward system, is under

fire. Its critics have perennially charged that it creates stagnation within departments. More recently, tenure ratio problems have barred younger faculty from permanent employment. Tenure's supporters cite its crucial importance in sustaining academic freedom.

Academics also fear that they are losing ground financially. Base salaries are not keeping up with the rate of inflation, and women's salaries average less than men's; however, total family income for faculty is comparable to that of other professions when spouses' earnings, consulting fees, and other activities are considered.

*Faculty Autonomy* — During its 1960's expansion, the higher education community relied on faculty values and judgments to develop a contemporary higher education system. In this era, faculty at the most prestigious levels realized independence in personnel and academic decisionmaking. Their careers served as models for the academic profession.

More recently, however, faculty perceive a loss of professional autonomy that may be traced to earlier growth. First, expansion required better management, which meant more administrative oversight and more centralization in academic decisionmaking. Second, higher education's expansion outdistanced its financial resources. The resulting financial difficulties have restricted and, in some cases, reduced faculty's independence in academic affairs. And third, the growth of the higher education industry has also resulted in greater federal oversight of academic affairs.

This turnaround in faculty autonomy is reflected in the advances made by collective bargaining in colleges and universities. Many observers believe faculty have resorted to collective bargaining to recoup some professional autonomy or to gain autonomy they never had but believe is due them. Faculty unions have showed steady growth since the late 1960's. More significantly, faculty are increasingly disposed to consider favorably the prospect of unionization.

There seems little cause for optimism given this somewhat dispiriting portrait of the academic profession and the hard facts about prospects for higher education. More importantly, however, faculty gloom seems to result from the dissonance in their lives between their expectations for their academic careers and their actual career paths. For most academics, higher education no longer promises the excitement of prestigious careers, rapid advancement, and professional prerogatives than it did through the 1960's. What seems called for is a new model of the academic profession that can reconcile academic values, such as the pursuit of knowledge, with the changing environment in higher education and faculty's real career profile.

*Introduction*

The academic profession reaped enormous benefits from the fifteen-year period of expansion in higher education that began in the late 1950's. Changes occurring in the profession during this time so redefined the concept of a faculty career that Jencks and Riesman (1969) said an "academic revolution" had taken place.

Faculty gains were fourfold. *First*, as higher education became a central social institution, a faculty career acquired status equivalent to that of the legal and medical professions. *Second*, the rapid expansion of colleges and universities escalated the demand for qualified faculty, so competition for their services was strong. Academics were virtually guaranteed job mobility within or among institutions. Such mobility afforded college teachers opportunities to develop satisfying academic careers. Mobility permitted them to choose their institutional setting, to satisfy their disciplinary interest, and to negotiate their terms and conditions of employment. *Third*, college faculty won, formally or informally, central roles in academic decisionmaking on many campuses. This advance seemed to assure the ascendency of the professoriate over other groups on campus. And *fourth*, seemingly unlimited financial resources available to higher education during this period helped to promote and consolidate the preceding achievements.

College and university faculty regard these gains as an integral part of the ideal academic career. But they now find this concept undermined by pressures affecting the higher education community; that is, colleges and universities are experiencing declines in enrollment growth and face straitened financial resources. Forecasts indicate that these problems will continue at a significant level through the end of this century.

Enrollment trends for higher education pose the most serious threat to the continuation of the faculty gains won in the 1960's. The expansion of the American professoriate during the 1960's was based upon unprecedented growth of the college-going population due to an unusual meshing of an enlarged national population and a greater rate of participation in higher education. Using 1955 as a base year, degree credit enrollment increased 35 percent in 1969, 108 percent in 1965, and 196 percent in 1970—a total increase of more than 5 million students (Shulman 1976).

Enrollment forecasts through the end of the century indicate that this growth will not occur again. Instead, recent enrollment projections suggest that colleges and universities will experience declines or minimal growth. The Carnegie Foundation (1975) projects an opti-

mum enrollment of slightly over 10 million full-time students by the year 2000, as compared with an enrollment of 6.5 million full-time students in 1973, assuming a constant 1973 enrollment rate. But this increase will only begin in the 1990's; through the 1980's higher education will experience almost no enrollment growth.

Faculty are keenly aware of the problems posed for their profession by this prognosis, since most are completely dependent on student enrollments to insure their employment.* Lack of demand for their services erodes the basis on which many of the 1960's gains were made: no longer a scarce resource, faculty compete with each other in a shrinking job market. They have lost the advantages of job mobility that were considered an essential and attractive aspect of the academic profession.

The financial outlook for higher education compounds the problems posed by enrollment trends. Since the late 1960's, colleges and universities have been beset by a range of financial difficulties. At first, administrators focused their concern on the "cost-income" problem, a situation in which colleges were operating on a deficit or near-deficit basis (Cheit 1971). This problem was attributed to institutions' efforts to expand and upgrade educational services during the 1960's without having sufficient funds to finance the endeavor. Since this condition was identified, institutions have worked for more efficient management to reverse their financial difficulties. Although financial problems continue, higher education analysts seem to have a more positive attitude about their ability to restore financial balance:

> although the present period is a painful one for those who are responsible for balancing the budgets of institutions of higher education . . . there is little question that there will be long-run net benefits . . . in the form not only of more effective institutional management but also, perhaps, of more effective sharing of resources among groups of institutions (Carnegie Commission 1972).

Currently, economists have become acutely sensitive to the particular difficulties the higher education industry faces in an inflationary economy. They note that inflation affects higher education more severely than other enterprises because it is a labor-intensive industry:

> College operating costs in the long run have risen faster than the inflation affecting the general economy because the largest purchase by colleges is faculty and other professional services (Halstead 1975, p. 28).

* Jencks and Riesman argue that this relationship is the basis for the continuation of undergraduate academic programs by professors more oriented to graduate study: "The crucial fact is that undergraduate instruction provides jobs for members of the academic profession" (1969, p. 245).

As professional salaries are an institution's major costs, they are also the expenditure over which an administration can exercise greatest control. Consequently, when colleges face rapid rises in consumer prices,* the most effective method of combating inflation has been to hold down faculty salaries. In 1972-73, faculty salaries kept up with the rate of inflation. Since then, the wage and price index has increased 95 percent while faculty salaries have only increased by about 65 percent. Wages and salaries to nonagricultural employees have increased by 110 percent; therefore, faculty salaries have fallen behind this group by about 45 percent ("Academic Salaries. . ." 1979). The effect of holding down faculty salaries has been dramatic. Previously, from 1965-1975, increases in the price of current operations of colleges and universities were 40 percent higher than the price increases for the general economy (Halstead 1975). In contrast, since 1975, the increased cost of operating institutions has remained below the general rate of inflation (Halstead 1977).

Higher education's financial problems clearly have an adverse effect on the academic profession: for example, job mobility is reduced when a college cuts its expenses by not replacing tenured faculty who leave, or hires a new teacher in a lower, or nontenured position. Colleges also may be unable to offer salaries high enough to attract desirable scholars. In addition, faculty may suffer economically because salaries are not keeping pace with the rate of inflation.

Academic life has clearly changed since its golden period. This research report looks at these changes in light of the academic model that served as a professional touchstone during the 1960's. Chapter one describes this model, specifically its values and career steps, and discusses the organizational setting in which the academic works. The remaining chapters consider aspects of the academic model under 1970's conditions: chapter two examines job mobility; chapter three describes changes in economic and personal rewards; and the concluding chapter discusses the effect of current conditions in higher education on faculty autonomy.

* For example, in 1977, institutions' utilities costs, as measured by the Higher Education Price Index, were 17.8 percent higher than their costs for the previous year (Halstead 1977, p. 14).

# The Academic Model

Higher education's prosperity during the 1960's provided a setting in which a model of academic life could be perfected: enrollments were large, faculty were in short supply, and financial resources seemed to be plentiful. Given these conditions, faculty won increased authority over academic affairs and employment standards and procedures. This prosperity no longer exists. Instead, shrinking budgets and enrollment conditions have begun to chip away at the gains won during the 1960's.

To understand how academic life is changing, it is necessary to describe the characteristics of the academic model as it was understood in its heyday. It is also necessary to discuss the organizational characteristics of the university as they affect faculty employment. Unlike other professional groups, faculty are uniquely dependent on an organizational setting to meet their career goals. The development of modern academic life under the aegis of the university system, described below, make this dependency inevitable. The structure and operations of the university are therefore important factors in shaping the academic model.

The academic model joins together the concepts of "academic profession" with "academic career." In the academic model, professional values determine the stages of the academic career, and are the criteria by which a faculty member's career advances. By academic profession is meant a set of professional values, e.g. autonomy and peer review, that are specifically tailored to the requirements of academic life. "Academic career" applies the career concept to the particular demands of academic life. A career is defined as a " 'succession of related jobs arranged in a hierarchy of prestige through which persons move in an orderly sequence' " (Light, Marsden, Corl 1972, citing Wilensky 1961).

*Historical Background*

Modern faculty life originated when the university system was established in the late nineteenth century. Previously, American college faculty were primarily employed to teach and to discipline students, and they were evaluated for these activities. Research interests might even be considered a drawback, since they suggested less than complete loyalty to college teaching (Jencks and Riesman 1969).

But this conception of the faculty's role began to change under the influence of America's university system. The practices and values of the university system are the basis of the academic model:

> [Universities] provided employment for men who did research and provided substantial rewards to those who did it well. They judged quality largely by asking other men with comparable training and interest what they thought of the work, rather than by asking laymen . . . they also created a supply of professional scholars by establishing graduate programs that trained and certified men for every field in which professorships existed (Jencks and Riesman 1968, p. 237).

Three central elements can be distinguished: (1) research is an important endeavor, and the focus of university life; (2) academic work requires peer judgment; and (3) scholarship is a vocation in its own right.

To these elements, the modern professoriate adds another: the profession has prestige because it serves important social goals. This component developed late. Before World War II, the academic profession was not on the same level as other professions in this country or as the academic profession in Europe:

> in Europe a professor is a lion who is diligently hunted by the arbiters of society, while in the United States he is as a lone ass braying in the desert. . . (Wilson 1942, p. 148, quoting Marten ten Hoor).

Wilson (1942) attributes the profession's comparatively low social standing to its openness to faculty of differing academic interests and abilities, its acceptance of faculty from mixed socioeconomic backgrounds, and America's failure to make "a place for an aristocracy of intellect in the same way it has for an aristocracy of wealth" (p. 149).

This perception of the importance of intellectual life in America began to change after World War II, when intellectual, scientific and scholarly activities became more important; consequently, academic life attracted new recruits from higher social backgrounds (Lipsett and Ladd 1979). Several surveys document this trend. For example, an AAUP comparison of its member's socioeconomic background in 1938, 1969, and 1975 shows an increasing percentage of faculty from professional, semiprofessional and white-collar families in more recent years: 27 percent, 39 percent, and 41 percent, respectively. Faculty from working-class backgrounds are the only other group to increase their membership significantly in those years: 12 percent, 24 percent, and 21 percent, respectively (Lipset and Ladd 1979). Similarly, a

1975 survey of faculty reports of their family's status when they were in high school show a higher percentage of faculty in the youngest age group — under 30 — come from wealthy or above average-income families than faculty in any other age cohort (Lipset and Ladd 1979).

*Characteristics of the Academic Model*

The academic model provides an academic value system that shapes the development of the faculty member's career. Ideally, values and career paths are inseparable components of academic life.

*Value Systems* — College faculty develop their academic value systems when they are in graduate school. Their departments and their professors exemplify academic life in several respects.* First, graduate professors work on a highly professional level if profession is defined as "a group that claims the right to regulate itself, determining its own methods and judging its own members" (Jencks and Riesman 1969, p. 238). Unlike other professionals, who depend on client approval for financial support, faculty are independent of virtually all evaluation except peer review: students have minimal influence, and research funds are awarded on the basis of peer judgment.

Second, graduate schools instill the concepts of the importance of research activity and loyalty to one's discipline. This latter emphasis reinforces the apprentice-scholar's original motivation toward academic life. Research shows that the professoriate choose their discipline first, usually when they decide on a major in college, but 50 percent do not select academic careers until they have entered graduate school. This discipline-first approach is strongest among faculty at prestigious institutions, and decreases as institutional prestige declines (Light, Marsden, Corl 1972).

The graduate schools of the 1960's epitomized the professional orientation of academics and their devotion to research and their disciplines. Most significantly, these schools were the environment in which today's academics were trained. Jencks and Riesman (1969, p. 250) defined the views of these training programs:

> The graduate academic departments are for the most part autotelic. They resent even being asked whether they produce significant benefits to society beyond the edification of their own members. To suggest that the advancement of a particular academic discipline is not synonymous with the advancement of the human condition is regarded as myopic. Perhaps, considering the affluence of American taxpayers and the relatively ample supply of talented, well-educated college graduates, it really is.

* The following discussion is based on Jencks and Riesman (1969, pp. 238-239).

This attitude is reflected in higher education's value system. Institutional prestige is traditionally associated with large, research-oriented institutions that employ highly qualified faculty who are actively engaged in research activities. Such institutions have the necessary resources to attract faculty:

> The academic conditions that qualified faculty members . . . value are most frequently found in large universities. It takes the economic and intellectual resources of a large academic enterprise to offer high salaries and to provide much advanced and highly specialized academic work, which furnish both the extrinsic and intrinsic rewards that facilitate recruiting qualified faculty (Blau 1973, p. 99).

The graduate departments' professional self-image and their interest in advancing knowledge is logically linked with another central value of the academic model: academic freedom in the conduct of research and in classroom instruction. The American Association of University Professors' 1940 statement on "Academic Freedom and Tenure" explains that this value is essential to "the free search for truth and its free exposition" (AAUP 1977, p. 2). Implict in this statement is the faculty member's right to determine what is important to study as well as the procedures and methods used. That is, academic freedom requires institutions to treat the academic as a professional capable of making independent judgments about his work, subject only to peer review.

*Career Paths* — Experts generally agree on the steps involved in the traditional academic career paths and the effect of 1960's affluence on faculty expectations of how a career develops and what rewards it offers. This viewpoint is an integral part of the academic model.

Light et al. (1972) developed a framework of the academic career that identifies its basic elements and clarifies how these elements interact to shape a total career. Their model combines "three analytically distinguished strands": the disciplinary career, the institutional career, and the external career (p. 8).

The disciplinary strand is foremost among the three strands because "the others depend on disciplinary criteria of success for standards of selection and advancement" (Light et al. 1972, p. 13). Further, a faculty member is primarily identified by his disciplinary career and his field of interest. This orientation extends and confirms the loyalty to one's discipline that is a tenet of the academic profession developed in graduate training. Within the disciplinary career strand several important stages can be identified:

> deciding to enter a field of specialization, admission to graduate school, achieving the requisite qualifications to be considered a disciplinary member, and producing a piece of research. Publication is a recurring crisis (Light et al. 1972, p. 10).

Beyond these bare requirements, faculty members have no clear-cut outline on how to proceed with their disciplinary careers. They acquire this knowledge through informal communication networks: professional meetings, reviews of the literature, conversations with colleagues (Light et al).

An institutional career begins, after the academic has established his disciplinary credentials, with the first full-time job at a college or university. The employing institution defines his responsibilities: teaching, student advising, committee work, and some research (Light et al. 1972). Rewards are "salary, influence, promotion, tenure, and local honors for outstanding contributions, such as prizes for teaching or service and chairs" (Light p. 11). Institutional rewards are primarily based on an evaluation of the academic's disciplinary activities.

This reward system reflects the research emphasis in graduate school, but it creates a basic conflict for the academic: he is trained in research but his doctorate is more important as certification for his employment as a college teacher. Therefore, his academic career generally reflects an effort to balance his research values with his employment obligations. This effort produces an uneasy employment situation:

> Although in most occupations men are judged by how well they perform their normal duties, the academic man is judged almost exclusively by his performance in a kind of part-time voluntary job (research) which he creates for himself. . . . It is only a slight exaggeration to say that academic success is likely to come to the man who has learned to neglect his assigned duties in order to have more time and energy to pursue his private professional interests. (Caplow and McGee 1958, p. 221)

For most faculty, the institutional career ends in promotion to associate or full professor.

Finally, the external career includes:

> all work related activities outside the institution but within the discipline. These include consulting, temporary full-time employment with industry or government, summer teaching . . . and any public work that draws on disciplinary skills (Light et al. p. 12).

This career develops later in life, after a scholar establishes his repu-

tation and acquires sponsorship. Clearly, this career's development is contingent upon achievement in the two other strands.

Within this framework, there are two salient qualities that make this profession unique: (1) tenure, or guaranteed academic employment, which is generally offered after five to seven years of probation; and (2) substantial employment mobility within and among institutions.

Of these two, academic tenure has long been considered an essential component of the academic model. The 1940 AAUP statement on "Academic Freedom and Tenure" marks the institutionalization of academic tenure in the profession. The statement notes that academic tenure is essential for college professors because it provides:

> (1) Freedom of teaching and research and of extramural activities and (2) a sufficient degree of economic security to make the profession attractive to men and women of ability. Freedom and economic security, hence, tenure, are indispensible to the success of an institution in fulfiling its obligation to its students and to society (AAUP 1977, p. 2).

In this conception, tenure translates a professional value into career terms.

Since the late 1950's, job mobility in the academic profession has, somewhat incongruously, existed side by side with academic tenure as an important aspect of the profession (Light 1972). Mobility became a significant consideration when "the accelerated scramble for positions of prestige and emolument in the college and university world [began]" (Barzun in Caplow and McGee 1958, p. v)*.

Both faculty and higher education institutions have used mobility opportunities as a personnel mechanism for career growth and job satisfaction and for meeting institutional needs. Caplow and McGee's classic study of *The Academic Marketplace* (1958) describes why faculty vacancies and replacements occurred in the liberal arts departments of nine major universities from 1954-56. In this study, the authors examine how mobility can work to the advantage of the faculty member and/or the institutions. From the faculty member's perspective, voluntary job changes may result from an outside offer that cannot be matched by the current employer. They note three kinds of "unbeatable" offers (p. 53): Bound To Rise — the individual's

* Previously, a somewhat static situation had prevailed. Writing in 1942, Logan Wilson observed, "there is a growing opinion that on advanced levels, the saturation point of employability in higher education is already close at hand (p. 30), although he does point out that population growth and different public attitudes about the value of higher education may alter this situation.

own prestige overshadows the institution's and he leaves for greener fields; El Dorado — a special factor such as location or cultural attraction draws the academic way; and the Silver Cord — the university that trained the faculty member has so much appeal that he will return there even if it means an economic loss. Better salary elsewhere would also seem to be a logical reason for leaving, but the findings on this issue are mixed, because departments and individuals engage in self-justification to defend the prestige of the department that has been left. For example, departments reporting vacancies often suggest that faculty left to seek higher salaries, but replacements report that their new positions offer opportunities for advancement not available in their previous positions (Caplow and McGee 1958, p. 36).

Conversely, a department only infrequently attempts to retain a faculty member who has received an outside offer. In a sample of 167 voluntary resignations, department chairmen knew of no retention efforts in 61 percent of the cases reported. The authors explain this lack of effort occurs because frequently the leaver is disliked, and the department is content to see him go. Also, faculty fear that if they bid competitively to retain a member and lose, their prestige will suffer.

*Academic Organizations*

Academics generally measure the quality of higher education institutions by how they support professional academic values. In the hierarchy of institutions, those at the top are seen to embody these values and to serve as models for all other institutions.* The key to understanding how academic quality is determined lies in examining how academic organizations serve faculty values.

For example, the most prestigious institutions are those that sponsor research and further disciplinary knowledge; their level of prestige depends on their faculty's scholarly contributions (Blau 1973). At the undergraduate level, select colleges that serve as training grounds for future academics and practitioners in other professional fields are also regarded as quality institutions. These institutions are identified as "university colleges" (Jencks and Riesman 1969, p. 24). They attract superior faculty, students, administrators, and the most generous

* To reiterate, those values that the academic profession considers essential are: professionalism, which includes self-regulation, peer review, and autonomy in determining methods of research; and disciplinary loyalty, i.e., efforts to advance knowledge in a particular field, principally through research and publication activities.

philanthropists. They are thought to exemplify undergraduate education at its best, and they serve as models for other colleges.

The organizational literature of higher education suggests that high-quality academic institutions function as professional organizations. However, Cohen and March's (1974) description of American colleges and universities as "organized anarchies" seems more accurate. An organized anarchy exhibits the following characteristics:

> (1) *Problematic goals* — The organization appears to operate on a variety of inconsistent and ill-defined preferences. . . . It discovers preferences through action more often than it acts on the basis of preference.
>
> (2) *Unclear technology* — . . . [the organization] operates on the basis of a simple set of trial-and-error procedures. . .
>
> (3) *Fluid participation* — The partcipants in the organization vary among themselves in the amount of time and effort they devote to the organization . . . standard theories of power and choice seem to be inadequate (p. 3).

These organizational characteristics seem to be compatible with the professoriate's desire to achieve independence in their professional decisionmaking processes. In fact, the ambiguity inherent in an organized anarchy would seem to enhance their power because there are no clear-cut paths to educational or research achievement. Thus, autonomy and independent thought are furthered by this method of organization.

"Organized anarchy" provides an overview of how higher education institutions operate. But within this whole there are vastly different organizational characteristics among colleges and universities, all of which affect faculty performance. Baldridge et al. (1978) analyze the structure of colleges and universities and report on factors that affect campus governance and influence faculty ability to function effectively. From 1970-1974 they studied a representative national sample of all colleges and universities and a representative sample of faculty members at those institutions. Their report examines academic organizations by institutional type and organizational factors. Their typology includes: *Private Multiuniversity* — large, very prestigious institutions that award at least twenty Ph.D.s or M.D.s and received at least $3 million in federal funds in 1970-1971; *Public Multiuniversity* — very large and prestigious public institutions that receive large amounts of federal research funds, and have highly prestigious graduate programs and faculties; *Elite Liberal Arts Colleges* — small, private, prestigious institutions with highly trained faculty and quality degree programs. They receive little federal grant money compared with the multiuniversities, but they are strong

centers for scholarship and research; *Public Comprehensive* — solid middle-quality state institutions that are most effective in their bachelor's program, but the majority offer some advanced degrees; *Public Colleges* — less distinguished in faculty quality, student selectivity, and degree programs than other public institutions. *Private Liberal Arts Colleges* — the best of these go into the Elite Liberal Arts Colleges category. Institutions included here offer at least a bachelor's degree and they are the most numerous institutional type in the country; *Community Colleges*—the fastest growing institutional type, these offer associate in arts degrees, and transfer and terminal programs; *Private Junior Colleges* — a declining segment of the higher education community, most have either been folding, or expanding to four-year institutions (Baldridge et al. 1978, pp. 59-60).

The authors identify organizational features that create diverse organizational patterns among institutions within the same categories; conversely, these organizational features can result in similar characteristics among institutions in different categories. These organizational features are: 1. environmental relations, *i.e.*, formal control structures, the political environment, the financial base and the client pool; 2. characteristics of the professional task — different levels of faculty activity are measured by the number of academic degree programs offered and the breadth of professional qualifications among faculty; and 3. institutional size and complexity — large size increases the complexity of an institution's decisionmaking process, and its administrative and departmental structures. Size also influences the amount of decentralization within an organization (Baldridge et al. 1978, pp. 62-67).

Based on both institutional typology and organizational features, the authors draw some conclusions about working environments for faculty. In general, they find that a higher place in the institutional typology corresponds to working conditions for faculty that reinforce the professional values of the academic model. For example, crossing institutional type with characteristics of professional-task expertise,* the authors find that colleges and universities in the upper half of the typology rank higher on all measures of professional task expertise than those at institutions lower down; source of control is not a factor in this ranking. Even more striking, is their finding that the extent of environmental influence on faculty life is determined more by institutional prestige than by source of control: "with a few minor

* These characteristics are: highest degree offered, Ph. D.'s on faculty, combined student SAT scores, faculty with published books, faculty with published articles.

exceptions, there is a relentless tendency for institutions with more doctorates and offering higher degrees to have lower levels of bureaucracy and higher faculty autonomy" (Baldridge et al., p. 124).

*Summary*

Modern academic life is based upon the values inherent in the academic model. This model originated with the rise of the university system in the late nineteenth century. Hence, the academic model's values are oriented to the goals and needs of that university system.

The university system revolutionized the concept of college teacher. It established the faculty's role as researcher and scholar first, teacher second. In so doing, it professionalized the faculty role: since scholarship requires specialized knowledge, academics can be judged only by similarly situated colleagues. Peer judgment was born, and with it came increased autonomy for faculty to decide what to teach and how to teach it.

In keeping with these values, upward career mobility is furthered by one's disciplinary orientation. Success in the discipline promises career rewards: guaranteed employment, institutional and disciplinary recognition, job mobility.

Later developments fleshed-out the academic model. After World War II, the academic profession gained in prestige, so that it was on a par with other professions. This success may be attributed to higher education's increasing importance in American society after the war; higher socioeconomic groups' greater rate of participation in the profession; and increasing job mobility, which promised a satisfying career. Prestige, important social goals, and job mobility are more recent attributes of the academic model.

Higher education's organizational settings reflect the academic model's values. The hierarchy of institutional prestige is based on the institution's orientation to research; its employment of recognized scholars in a field; and the resources it has to sustain its scholars' work. Undergraduate education is less valued, except as it serves as a pretraining period for future scholars.

This concept of academic life served faculty well through the late 1950's and early 1960's. But current enrollment and financial problems point up crucial flaws in this model. Lacking sustained growth, the higher education community does not have a personnel policy that maintains traditional faculty values and job satisfaction. The next chapter looks at the first casualty of the academic model during this depressed period: faculty job mobility.

# Faculty Job Mobility

Academics have long relied on job mobility to achieve job satisfaction. At the same time, colleges and universities have used job mobility as a means of shaping their own faculty profile. But this mechanism for satisfying institutional and faculty needs began to malfunction in 1968-1969 when the first signs of a declining job market appeared.

The poorer job market situation was not immediately recognized by many in the higher education community. Even in 1969, when demographic information on enrollment decreases in the 1980's and the 1990's was available, most analysts still feared a shortage of college faculty. Consequently, federal education officials stressed the need for larger numbers of college faculty at the doctoral level, and graduate programs continued to expand:

> [between 1968 and 1972] doctorates awarded grew by 10,600 (46 percent) and first-year enrollments in graduate programs expanded by 155,000 (34 percent); the number of universities awarding the doctorate grew by more than 40 between 1968 and 1974, and many additional doctoral programs were initiated that had not yet awarded a degree by 1974 (Cartter 1976, pp. 20-21).

This optimistic outlook for college faculty employment came to a halt in the mid-1970's when the apparent oversupply of college faculty was coupled with an economic recession (Cartter 1976). The academic community became aware of a great surplus in the faculty job market, which was largely caused by the 1968-72 growth in doctorate production.

Statistics show a declining need for new college teachers through the 1990's and also forecast decreasing mobility for faculty already employed. Higher education observers are concerned about how these realities will affect the quality of the academic staff and the morale of the higher education community. To offset some of the worst consequences of a poor job market, some educators are developing innovative solutions to make Ph.D.s marketable once again, within and outside academe.

### *Statistical Information*

Since 1974, academics' general cognizance of faculty oversupply has

prompted a considerable amount of research on what specific faculty employment problems lie ahead. A number of factors are built into these projections that are subject to change, and thus final predictions may differ, but all forecasts point to significant unemployment for doctorate holders if current conditions continue.

A recent study of the faculty job market through the year 2000 establishes a framework for analysis. Radner and Kuh (1978) forecast faculty employment based on a demographic model.*

> There is a given faculty/student ratio and a given ratio of doctoral to total faculty. Thus demand for doctoral faculty depends on the numbers of students who go to four year colleges and universities. New hiring depends on the number of retirements and the change in enrollments (p. 5).

They project a highly erratic situation: doctorate hires will plateau at approximately 10,000 in the 1980's, drop to about 6,000 by 1985, rise again to about 10,000 in 1990, dropping again in the early 1990's to a new low of about 3,000, before beginning to climb to a high of 15,000 in the year 2000, under optimistic projections, or rising only to slightly over 7,500, assuming zero enrollment growth after 1995.

To understand the enormity of the projected doctoral crunch, these figures must be viewed in the context of overall projections for faculty doctorate production. The National Center for Education Statistics projects an annual increase in new doctorates from 34,000 in 1976 to 42,000 by 1986.** Based on the most optimistic demand projections, the expected surplus of new doctorates is alarming: by 1982, the surplus of supply to demand may be more than 16 percent of supply; for 1986, this figure may be over 36 percent; and between 1981 and 1986, an annual surplus of 2,000 new doctorates is anticipated. (Spence in Fincher et al., 1978). Some disciplines will suffer more than others. For example, projections on doctorates in the humanities suggest that by 1985 there will be a cumulative surplus of 20,000 to 30,000 more doctorates than there are teaching positions (Solmon et al., 1978).

Tenure ratios and the age profile of faculty are two key factors in this gloomy prognosis. First, tenure involves long-term economic and

---

* Variables considered in this model include: (1) projections of the number of eighteen-year-olds who will enroll in college from 1976-2000; (2) student/faculty ratios; (3) rates of attrition for senior and junior faculty members; (4) the tenure ratio (new hires and time needed to gain tenure); and (5) changes in the law affecting mandatory retirement.

** Over half of the projected degrees for this period are in education fields, but most of these degree holders will not become faculty in higher educational institutions; therefore the figures that follow exclude education doctorates.

educational policy investments. Given current tenure ratios and projections for future growth in higher education, administrators are reluctant to make commitments that further reduce their flexibility in responding to financial problems and changes in students' educational interests.* A survey of more than 1200 colleges and universities showed a clear negative trend on awarding tenure. Of these institutions, 69 percent reported an increase of more than 5 percent in the number of tenured faculty from 1968-1974; by contrast, only 46 percent anticipate such an increase through 1980, a decline of 23 percent. At the same time, nontenured hiring will also decline by 20 percent; only 30 percent of the institutions surveyed anticipate more than a 5 percent increase in their nontenured faculty. The large decrease is anticipated because some nontenured faculty will gain tenure, and reductions in force are more likely to occur by not hiring new nontenured employees or by firing those with the least seniority (Glenny et al., 1976).

Several reports suggests that an already high ratio of tenured to nontenured faculty acts as a barrier to the hiring of new tenure track employees and to promoting faculty to tenure. A 1973 study found that 65 percent of all faculty have tenure, and that figure is expected to rise to 78 percent by 1980 (Glenny et al., citing Bayer and Mann, p. 340). Further, a 1978 survey of four-year colleges showed that 50 percent of the faculty have tenure (Radner and Kuh, citing the American Council on Education).**

Second, the current faculty age profile points to a further reduction in the potential for faculty mobility through promotion or new hiring. Reports on the age profile show that the vast majority of faculty are in their mid-30s to mid-40s, reflecting the expansion in hiring that occurred during the 1960's and 1970's. Ladd and Lipset (1978) report that 58 percent of the faculty are under 45 years old; 24 percent are under 35; 34 percent are in the 35-to-44 age group; 25 percent are in the 45-to-54 age group; and only 17 percent are in the 55-and-over age group. This age distribution suggests that little attrition through retirement can be expected for some time; moreover, the new manda-

* A recent study in colleges and universities finds that the rate of granting tenure during the 1960's [behaved] as an economic variable in the sense that higher tenure rates occurred at the same time as the rapid increase in employment in academia (Kuh 1978, p. 4).

** Atkinson (1967) reports that this figure is even higher in the sciences and engineering. From 1968 to 1974, tenured faculty increased to 70 percent overall, while young faculty with doctoral degrees declined from 42 percent to 27 percent in the same period.

tory age retirement laws, effective for faculty in 1982, will not have a significant impact on higher education for about twenty years.

Thus, the age profile of faculty can be expected to move upward through the year 2000:

> the median age of faculty . . . was 39 in 1970, will increase to 48 by 1990. . . . The dramatic change between today and 1990 would be the virtual disappearance of the under 35 age group from the teaching ranks (Ladd and Lipsett 1978, citing Cartter).

In fact, one analyst has concluded that under current conditions, the best hope for new academic employment for the next twenty years lies in "net faculty departures" (Solmon 1978b). Solmon notes that with a tighter job market,

> the number of faculty changing institutions fell significantly from 8 percent in the mid-1960s to 4.5 percent in 1968-69 to 1.4 percent in 1972. Between these last two years, job changes as a percentage of new hires rose from 33.4 percent to 36.1 percent, reflecting lower total hiring in academe (Solmon 1978b, p. 344).

Given these conditions, "a one percent net out-migration rate for senior faculty could create 4000 academic job openings annually" (Solmon 1978b, citing Freeman and Breneman).

*Impact of the Ph.D. Surplus*

These approaching employment problems are clearly disturbing to the academic community. Observers believe that fewer job opportunities will impair the quality of academic life in several areas. Foremost among the issues presented is a concern that talented, young Ph.D.'s will not stay in academic life because opportunities for employment and promotion will be so limited. These people will either leave because they have attractive offers in the corporate sector, or a dearth of faculty positions will force their departure (Baratz 1978; Atkinson 1976). Further, they fear that loss of young faculty threatens this country's capacity for creative, productive scholarship. Generally, young Ph.D.'s who do not enter academic life will not be able to do research elsewhere. Several studies demonstrate that there is a "relationship between early publication and total career scholarly contribution . . . based on data from nearly every discipline, [including] measures of quality as well as quantity of output, and [it] holds true irrespective of sex" (Blackburn 1978, p. 102).

Scientists fear this problem is particularly pressing in their fields. Looking at supply-and-demand figures for scientists, Atkinson (1976) comments that:

> a number of interacting factors . . . threaten in the next ten or twenty years to erode our capacity to do world class science in our universities. It is in the universities that 55 percent of all our basic scientific research is performed (p. 1).

Departmental quality may also be an issue in a no-growth, highly tenured situation. Furniss (1978) describes institutional goals that would enable a college to adapt to changing circumstances yet maintain its quality. He suggests these goals should include:

> having a faculty of men and women, distributed by age, fully qualified for their assigned work, and demonstrating excellent or better performance according to their length of experience; most of them will be full time with tenure or with a reasonable chance of tenure. . . (p. 19).

To achieve its goals, the institution should develop a strategy for faculty quality. The strategy should consider: (1) all vacant positions belong to the institutions, not to any department; (2) faculty selection standards should be high, including contract renewal standards; (3) faculty quality should be defined in relation to institutional mission, which should be considered at times of contract renewal, tenure awards, promotions, and salary increases; and (4) "the goal [should be] a substantial percentage of tenured and fully qualified faculty members, with a small but regular turnover" (Furniss 1978, p. 23).

Faculty mobility problems may affect even the most prestigious institutions. A recent survey showed that respected institutions face problems in attracting outside senior faculty they believe necessary to maintain their institutional reputation (Scully 1978). Recruiters find inflation makes a move economically unfeasible for faculty established elsewhere. At the same time, institutions like Harvard that have traditionally used young, talented faculty for a limited time before they went to tenured positions elsewhere, find that these people are unwilling to risk following this pattern; they fear they will not be able to move to tenured positions elsewhere.

Finally, faculty morale inevitably is affected by lack of fresh employment opportunities. Currently employed faculty entered their profession in the belief that upward mobility was a significant component of an academic career; job mobility signified that they could develop satisfying career plans.*

* In fact, mobility prospects do generate positive attitudes toward work. Looking at employees in a corporate setting, Kanter (1977) notes that opportunity structures shape behavior in such a way that they confirm their own prophecies. Consequently, people who are in high mobility tracks tend to develop attitudes and values that impel them further along the track: work commitment, high aspirations, and work orientations (p. 158).

Solmon (1978) notes that this aspect of the academic profession has gone down the drain for many faculty:

> many of us were originally attracted to the profession by its peripatetic aspect. . . . At the present time, . . . the first teaching job will probably stretch into 40 years of routine unbroken by the illusion or reality of greener fields (p. 6).

*Coping With the Steady State*

Faculty employment difficulties have spawned new programs and proposals to alleviate the oversupply problem. These efforts range from helping young doctorates find employment in or out of academia to providing new opportunities for older faculty, thereby opening up tenure-track positions to younger scholars. The following list describes such plans:

• *National Science Foundation proposals for university-based scientific research:* In a series of recommendations to insure continuity of basic research, an NSF task force proposes four programs that would open up employment opportunities for scientists: (1) a national postdoctoral fellowship program with three-year awards to candidates who at the time of their application have not had their Ph.D. degree for more than one year. Fellows would choose their institutions and the investigator with whom they want to work. Support would come from NSF funds allotted to investigators for hiring postdoctoral fellows. (2) NSF Research Career Development Awards to universities for specified young scientists who have already demonstrated their research potential, but are not established as independent investigators. These awards would extend up to five years, but the university would have to offer its holder a tenure-track position. (3) NSF Research Scientist Awards to faculty in their mid-career. These awards would be for three years and would support faculty in changing scientific fields or in intensifying research activity. The winners would have a leave of absence from normal university responsibilities. (4) National research professorships to individuals who have had distinguished scientific careers. These professorships would support the scientist for the rest of his research career and free him from university duties. The university would be expected to use its salary savings to employ young faculty in the same department (Carter 1978).

• *Junior Scholar Program:* A program to award fellowships, whose number and duration is fixed so that total placements of new Ph.D.'s remains at some predetermined level. Generally that level is set so

that these fellows can receive teaching appointments during the next five years. The program would liquidate itself soon after the year 2000. The proposal offers three program options for determining the number and duration of the fellowships: (1) CBE75000: using Census Based Enrollment estimates, demand for new Ph.D.'s is maintained at 7,500 through the year 2000. (2) ZEG5900: assumes zero enrollment growth in the 1990's, Ph.D. demand is maintained at 7,500 in the 1980's and at 5,900 in the 1990's. This 5,900 level means the program ends in the year 2000. (3) ZAE7000: same as the preceding program, except that new Ph.D. demand is maintained at 7,000 during the 1990's. Consequently, the program cannot end in 2000. (4) A-B Program: similar to the proposal below, this program provides 1,000 five-year post-doctoral fellowships from 1979 to 1995 (Radner and Kuh 1978).

• *National Professorships and Postdoctoral Fellowships:* Similar to the A-B program and the NSF task force recommendations above, this proposal by the director of the National Science Foundation would provide federal funds to establish 1,000 research professorships and 1,000 new postdoctoral fellowships. The professorships would be for five years, renewable for another five, and would be given to distinguished scholars to conduct research full-time. Their teaching positions would be filled by junior faculty who would be in tenure-track positions. The postdoctoral fellows might be attached to research centers, and would receive initial five-year appointments; they would also be expected to teach (Baratz 1978b).

• *Careers in Business:* Supported by foundations, businesses, and a grant from the National Endowment for the Humanities, this program selects 50 new doctorates, or those who have completed all but their dissertation, for an intensive seven-week summer program in business training, including skills, orientation and socialization to the business world. Candidates come from the humanities and social science disciplines. The program has completed the first of its two years of operation. Most trainees having gone on to business careers; only two decided to return to academic life (*Careers in Business* 1978).

• *Increase Use of Part-Time Faculty:* Blackburn (1978) proposes that institutions make more creative use of part-time faculty to support young doctorates and to sustain vitality in college and university departments. At the entry level, two part-timers might be employed for each vacant faculty position. Their non-faculty time could be

spent in other on-campus duties or outside the institution. At the exit level, senior faculty may be offered the option of half-time employment, and their duties could be filled by younger faculty.

*Summary*

Academics can no longer consider easy access to college and university employment a characteristic of their profession. Several events have conspired to create a tight job market; decline in enrollment, a faculty employment bulge in the mid-career years; and incorrectly planned expansion of doctorate production in the late 1960's and early 1970's.

Researchers have defined the dimensions of the supply problem. They have developed information on faculty supply and demand ratios through the year 2000; tenure and faculty age issues have been described in terms of their impact on the job market; and proposals and programs for increasing the country's capacity for absorbing Ph.D.-trained scholars have been presented.

But two issues related to faculty mobility need further exploration. First, what is the role of the graduate school? Should graduate schools set rates of doctoral production, *i.e.*, limit enrollments because fewer academic appointments are available, and thus close out some of their own positions? Further, do graduate faculty have an ethical obligation to advise applicants about realistic prospects for academic employment? Given current prospects, graduate faculties may want to consider reorganizing their programs so that students may be trained for careers within or outside of academe. To do this, graduate faculty themselves may need some training about opportunities in the corporate world, since most "know little, if anything, about jobs outside academe" (Solmon, Ochsner, and Hurwicz, p. 57).

Second, how does lack of job mobility affect faculty morale? There is little literature available that specifically relates mobility to morale problems in higher education. Anecdotal information suggests that the mobility/morale nexus is a widespread problem for administrators and faculty. These groups have little experience in using personnel mechanisms for improving morale in a static job market. They need to look at new procedures for coping with faculty dissatisfactions.

# The Academic Reward System

The academic model holds that teaching, research, and community service are the core of academic life. Research, however, commands the scholar's first loyalty and is valued above other activities. Consequently, academic evaluations and rewards have traditionally stressed the quality and quantity of research endeavors over teaching and service activities.

It has become axiomatic that this reward system is incongruent with the interests and activities of the majority of college and university faculty. Most faculty devote their careers to college teaching; they spend little time in research. This apparent inconsistency between academic rewards and activities was generally overlooked during the 1960's. Jobs were plentiful and faculty could achieve satisfactory employment. But the current static market situation makes rewards more important in promoting job satisfaction on campus. Consequently, the higher education community is taking another look at how it rewards its faculties.

This review of faculty rewards is divided into three areas: (1) a description of faculty activities and preferences; (2) an analysis of how academic rewards serve faculty needs; and (3) a discussion of efforts to refocus the reward system.

### *Faculty Activities/Preferences*

Writing in 1958, Caplow and McGee observed:

> For most members of the profession, the real strain in the academic role arises from the fact that they are, in essence, paid to do one job, whereas the worth of their services is evaluated on the basis of how well they do another (p. 82).

Twenty years later, this observation still hold true: faculty face conflicts over how to employ their time.

Several surveys document the fact that most faculty give little, if any time to research and publication efforts. Surveying over 3,500 college and university faculty in 1975, Ladd and Lipsett (1978) report that only a small segment of the professoriate actively engages in research and publication:

> Over half of all those employed full-time . . . have never brought to publication any sort of book, written or edited, singularly or in collaboration

> with others. . . . More than one-third have never published an article. Half . . . have not published anything, or had anything accepted for publication, in the last two years. More than a quarter of all full-time academics have never published a work anywhere, at any time in their careers (pp. 73-74).

Evidently, research productivity is concentrated in the hands of a relatively small segment of the professoriate. Since the academic community accords prestige to research activity, it is to be expected that research faculty are concentrated in large, prestigious universities. Even here, however, faculty do not spend the majority of their time in research. Baldridge (et al. 1978) report that faculty at private multiuniversities garner the most research time — 25 percent of their work activities, followed by 22 percent for faculty in public multiversities. For each group, publication of articles in the last four years averaged 7.4 and 6.8, while the average number of books in the last four years was .9 and .8 respectively.

Conversely, teaching is the dominant mode of academic life. Ladd and Lipsett (1978) report that in spring 1975, half of all faculty spent ten or more hours per week teaching; one-third taught thirteen hours or more; only one-sixth had four hours or less of classroom teaching. As with research, the teaching burden differs by institutional level, with more prestigious institutions devoting less time to this activity. For example, faculty at private multiversities spend 32 percent of their time in undergraduate teaching and 23 percent in graduate training, in contrast to public comprehensive universities where faculty spend 58 percent of their time in undergraduate teaching and 19 percent in graduate training (Baldridge et al. 1978).

The teaching function also differs by sex. Overall, women are concentrated in greater numbers in teaching-oriented institutions than are men: 68 percent of all women faculty work in lower-tier institutions, while 53 percent of male faculty are employed there. Moreover, in every institutional category, women spend more time in college teaching than their male colleagues, and they also engage in less graduate teaching, where the opportunity is available. For instance, in private multiversities (which have a larger percentage of women faculty than their public counterparts), women spend 52 percent of their time in undergraduate teaching and 17 percent in graduate training, compared to male faculty rates of 30 percent and 20 percent, respectively.

This pattern of activity clearly differs from the values and career paths established in the academic model, which stresses research activities. There are no clear-cut indicators of whether faculty prefer

the existing pattern or would rather see a greater orientation toward the academic model. The 1975 Ladd-Lipset survey (1978) indicates that a significant percentage of faculty seem to be comfortable with their teaching role. The authors report that faculty, including those at the most prestigious institutions, prefer teaching to research: 70 percent of all faculty emphasize that teaching is their primary interest. These findings conflict with earlier data of Light, Marsden, and Corl (1972) that report faculty feel burdened by their obligation to meet their teaching responsibilities, and wish to carry on research. At the lower-level institutions, for example, the authors cite 1968 data showing that those faculties want to double research time; at middle-level institutions, there was evidence that administrators exerted pressure on faculty to increase their publication efforts, so that institutional prestige would improve. The disagreement between these two studies may be partially accounted for by the seven-year increase in faculty age since the first survey was taken. Ladd and Lipsett (1978) report that, not unexpectedly, younger faculty who need to establish their academic credentials are more concerned with research activity than their older colleagues, and are less committed to teaching. At the same time, younger faculty are significantly more interested in publishing: from 1973-1975, 43 percent of those under 35 have published, while more than half of those fifty-five years and older have not published anything.

*Rewards*

College and university faculty have often voiced dissatisfaction over aspects of the academic reward system. But their dissatisfaction has increased and become more widespread in the higher education community because financial and demographic problems make it more difficult for the individual faculty member to resolve his dissatisfaction through a job change or other means.

Academic rewards refer to the tangible rewards that mark a career's development: promotion, tenure, and financial compensation. Ideally, academic rewards are granted on the basis of peer judgment. But, in fact, peer judgment is the predominant mode of evaluation only at institutions where research and publication are important faculty activities. These institutions are prestigious colleges and universities in the higher education hierarchy. Baldridge et al. (1978) report that faculty colleagues are prime evaluators at the majority of private multiuniversities and elite liberal arts colleges (64 percent and 58 percent, respectively) and at 43 percent of all public multiuniversities. Below this group, the percentage of institutions report-

ing peer evaluation as a major method of judgment drops so precipitously that the *national average of all institutions using peer judgment is only 25 percent.*•

Colleges and universities more closely adhere to the dictates of the academic model when they evaluate faculty activities for promotion, tenure, and other awards. The model holds that faculty responsibilities include research, teaching, and service, but there is an implicit assumption that research is the most important activity. Institutions act on this assumption even when they do not rely on peer judgment, which is necessary to evaluate specialized research, and even when research is not a primary focus of the institution. Baldridge et al. report that "in general, the weight of research in evaluation is roughly one and one-half times greater than the percent of time spent on it — in *all* types of institutions" (pp. 109-110).

At the same time, undergraduate teaching, which occupies most faculty time and interest, is significantly underevaluated:

> "in *every* type of institution, undergraduate teaching is given less "actual" weight in the evaluation process than the percentage of time people spend on it. . . . In the elite multiuniversities the disparity is quite large —people spend roughly 34 percent of their time on undergraduate teaching (Baldridge, et al., 1978), but it accounts for only about 20 percent of their evaluation for promotion and tenure. In other types of institutions the imbalance is not as heavy, but undergraduate teaching still never gets its full weight in the evaluation (p. 109).

Finally, service is not given any significant weight in the evaluation process. Baldridge et al. find that service is so underrated they do not include any figures on the weight given it in the evaluation process.

*Tenure* — In the academic model, tenure is the lynchpin of the academic reward system: it is the goal toward which young faculty work; it marks the junior scholar's acceptance into a higher rank; and, barring egregious behavior, it promises academic employment through retirement.

But the tenure system is not universally admired. Its critics charge that it fosters lethargic professors who, secure in their employment, are nonproductive scholars and ineffective or lackadaisical teachers. In response, tenure proponents assert that tenure is necessary to pre

---

• Baldridge et al. find this a disturbing situation: ". . . remembering that professionals demand the right to evaluate themselves, does it mean that the level of professionalism is low in most of higher education? Our figures suggest that this is exactly the case" (p. 109).

serve and strengthen academic freedom, which is necessary to the search for knowledge.*

This debate takes on a new urgency under current faculty market conditions. Again, critics argue that tenure promotes stagnation, but this time they note that a tight job market exacerbates the effect of tenure. One academic, who renounced his tenure, charges

> tenure is now beginning to lock faculty into their jobs the way nonportable and nonvested pensions and other employment perquisites lock people into jobs in industry and government. Particularly older faculty members of average abilities . . . fear that if they give up tenure in one university they will not get it again in another (O'Toole 1978, p. 26).

O'Toole also asserts that the tenure system disregards new understandings of how career patterns and personal development work together. New management theories have incorporated the notion that people move through different stages of development, each stage involving new human needs and requiring different personal adaptations. Tenure does not take these developments into account, providing no incentives for further growth (O'Toole 1978). O'Toole suggests that the process of gaining tenure is so draining that many "never again find the energy to grow" (p. 26).

Tenure's supporters continue to insist that tenure's primary purpose, protection of academic freedom, cannot be achieved by other means. In response to O'Toole, Van Alstyne (1978) notes:

> The essence of tenure is wholly in the complement of reliable procedural requirements it affords as protection against summary, unilateral, unexplained, and unreviewable nonrenewal (p. 45).

Without tenure, Van Alstyne explains, nonrenewed faculty members would find it difficult to win their jobs back through the courts. Tenure provides a basis for judicial determination on whether proper procedures have been followed and whether the terms of employment have been met, *e.g.* the tenure system signifies a presumption of fitness for the job, and it requires that faculty be dismissed only for cause.

Moreover, Van Alstyne quarrels with O'Toole's belief that a contract renewal system as opposed to tenure, would stimulate professorial activity. On the contrary, Van Alstyne argues that such a system would "keep [the faculty] on their knees" (p. 46).

Recently, tenure has also produced a major rift between younger,

* For a review of the arguments for and against tenure, see Linney (1979).

untenured faculty and older, tenured members. Many younger faculty cannot expect to get tenure because their departments are already heavily tenured and institutions are reluctant to reduce their program flexibility further by granting more tenure appointments. This situation creates discontent among younger faculty whose hopes for tenure are slight. Morton I. Baratz, general secretary for the American Association of University Professors, notes that the AAUP's membership is predominantly over forty years old. Younger academics tend not to join the AAUP, viewing it as a guild for the protection of the tenured (Baratz 1978b).

*Financial Rewards* — The academic profession was long noted for its poor economic compensation. This characteristic of the academic profession changed during the 1960's, when competition for faculty and greatly improved financial resources resulted in significantly higher salaries for faculty.

But higher education's financial pressures have slowed the gains won by faculty during the 1960's. Academic salaries have not kept pace with the rate of inflation since 1971. Halstead (1977) reports that institutions have used their control over faculty salaries to protect themselves from the ravages of inflation.*

> Since 1971, salaries paid faculty and other professionals have increased at an annual compound rate of 4.8 percent, substantially less than the 6.7 percent yearly inflation rate for the economy as measured by the Labor Department's Consumer Price Index. In 1977 faculty salaries increased 4.7 percent while the CPI rose 5.8 percent. With faculty salaries totaling nearly $6.5 billion, this 1.1 percent difference meant savings to institutions of approximately $70 million in 1977 (Halstead 1977, pp. 12-13).

Despite this loss to inflation, other evidence suggests that academics fare better than their basic salary scales would indicate. Ladd and Lipset (1978) report that *total family income* for academics places them on an economically sound basis compared with families headed by a professional. In 1974, median family income was $19,000 for all professionals. Among academics, median family income averaged $23,000, ranging from $21,000 in the humanities up to $40,000 for medical faculty.

This overall success may mask some other problems in the financial reward structure. First, women faculty's salaries still lag behind men's. One study, using 1972-1973 data, indicates that when factors influenc-

* "The Higher Education Price Index assigns to payroll costs nearly four times as much weight as given to all other costs combined," since higher education is a labor-intensive industry (Halstead 1977, p. 12).

ing salary — degree, rank, years of employment — were controlled statistically, women on the average received $3,000 less in salary than men. Further, when formulas used to predict salaries for male faculty were used for women faculty, salaries averaged $1,680 higher than actual for full women professors, and $600 higher than actual for "all faculty." These formulas incorporate publications, rank, tenure, years of employment, and advanced degrees (Bayer and Astin, cited in Trivett 1978).*

More recent data from the National Center for Education Statistics (Grant and Lind 1978, p. 98) indicates that women still have not won parity with men: in 1975-1976 full-time male faculty earned an average of $17,380 on 9-to-10-month contracts ($20,989 on 11 to 12-month contracts), while women only averaged $14,259 on 9 to 10-month contracts ($16,512).

Second, some evidence indicates that faculty who publish receive more in salary than nonpublishers. Thus, the financial reward structure also perpetuates the academic model's emphasis on research. A report based on a 1973 study of faculty nationwide (Tuckman and Tuckman 1976, cited in Trivett 1978) indicates that university faculty's salaries are based on their publication record, except at the assistant professor level. For example, a full professor who has published more than 50 articles can earn $5,500 more than his counterpart who has no articles published at all.

Faculty's relatively comfortable economic status may be accounted for by several factors. First, basic salaries are reported for the academic year, which is *nine months* in the Halstead figures cited above. Faculty may pick up additional income from teaching courses out of the regular year. Second, two-income families are becoming increasingly common in the academic profession, as they have in other professional middle classes. Third, faculty can increase their incomes substantially through outside consulting activities. This advantage varies by discipline: for example, business administration faculty earn 20 percent of their basic university salary in outside consulting; 58 percent of engineering faculty consider consulting a major source of supplementary earnings, as do 36 percent of school-of-education faculty. Most humanities faculty, however, only earn extra income through summer teaching (Ladd and Lipsett 1978).

Consulting is therefore an important source of income for many

* For a full discussion on women's compensation, see Gappa, Judith M. and Uehling, Barbara S. *Women in Academe: Steps to Greater Equality*. ERIC/AAHE Research Report No. 1. Washington, D. C.: American Association for Higher Education, 1979.

faculty. But some observers question its effect on the higher education community. In his proposal to study supplement salaries, Linnell (1978)* comments:

> Current [supplemental salary] policies appear to encourage university personnel to neglect academic pursuits of potential great benefit to society in favor of short-term financial payoffs to the participating individuals. Apparent and actual conflict-of-interest situations involving academics and contractual relations to produce added income tend to erode the public image of higher education and the credence given academic advice to public issues (n.p.n.).

*Changing the Reward System*

It is generally acknowledged that the weight given to research activity in faculty evaluations is inappropriate: faculty activities and interests are in teaching, not research; and most institutions' major activity is undergraduate teaching. Therefore:

> there must be some resolution of the conflict between the clear and direct rewards that accompany achievement in scholarship and research and the nominal recognition, despite sociological expectation, accorded to the education of students (Duryea 1973, p. 76).

This criticism carries greater weight in recent years because declining enrollments and a tighter job market make students more valuable. Faculty need to serve their students effectively if they want to keep students' interest in their discipline and keep their departments viable; therefore, effective teaching is important.

A recent project to improve teaching specifically recognizes the dangers to a discipline if teaching ability is not valued. Under the aegis of the American Sociological Association, a Project on Teaching Undergraduate Sociology has been developed to mobilize the discipline around teaching (Scully 1978b). Begun four years ago, the project serves as a resource center for departments and faculty members interested in improving their teaching. Its administrators find that enrollment declines, particularly in the number of majors, have activated departmental interest in teaching and made the project a more valuable resource because departments recognize that their discipline may be at stake. The project's goals, however, go beyond

* Linnell is currently directing a study on supplemental salaries based on a survey of American Association of Universities' institutions. The survey requests information on: (1) nine- and twelve-month salaries; (2) policy and practice for salary supplements by or through the university; and (3) comparison of salary reported to and by the American Association of University Professors with actual salary paid. One outcome of this project will be a monograph, to be published late in 1979, on "Academic Compensation and Supplemental Income: Ethical and Economic Issues and Recommendations for Change" (Linnell 1978).

developing new teaching techniques. Its directors want to elevate the status of teaching:

> To encourage academic departments of sociology in universities to incorporate deliberate preparation for teaching into their graduate curriculum. . . . To enhance among teachers of sociology a sense of importance about teaching and a sense of personal and professional worth about being teachers (cited in Scully 1978b, p. 14).

Similar goals were expressed by the supporters of the Doctor of Arts degree, which was developed in the early 1970's to provide graduate-level preparation for college teaching. The Doctor of Arts degree developed in response to public demand for more competent college teaching. Doctor of Arts programs include among their goals: "broad coverage of a discipline or field relevant to undergraduate education," expertise in the issues involved in undergraduate education, and an internship in college-level teaching (Dressel and Thompson 1977, p. 13).

Initial support for the Doctor of Arts concept slackened as new conditions emerged in higher education: (1) a glut of Ph.D.s on the industrial and government job markets; (2) loss of funding for graduate study; (3) state moratoriums on new academic degrees; (4) decline in undergraduate enrollments; and (5) a surplus of new Ph.D.s (Dressel and Thompson 1977, p. 16). However, the D.A. programs have continued. As of 1977, twenty-three institutions support Doctor of Arts programs. They have awarded 482 such degrees and enrolled 740 students in 1977.

*Summary*

The academic value system holds that research is a faculty member's highest duty. Teaching is secondary, and effective teaching requires a teacher to be stimulated by his research efforts. This value system is incongruent with the realities of academic life. Most institutions' primary goal is to teach undergraduate and graduate students. Appropriately, most faculty help to implement this goal: at all institutional levels faculty spend the major part of their careers in teaching. For many, the teaching function corresponds to their real interests.

Nevertheless, the reward system reflects the values of the academic model. At every institutional level, except two-year colleges, research is more important in evaluating faculty for rewards (promotion and tenure) than teaching. Thus, faculty continually experience dissonance in their careers: they are paid to teach, and many claim to derive their job satisfaction from this activity, but research is the activity that brings career rewards.

Higher education commentators have long recognized this inherent conflict in the academic profession. Twenty years ago Caplow and McGee described the teaching/research conflict; it continued to be a controversial subjects when Jencks and Riesman identified it in 1968; Ladd and Lipset note that the conflict continues in 1978. In this span of time, higher education has had little need to face the teaching/research conflict. When jobs and resources were plentiful, it hardly impinged upon faculty rewards: salaries were improving, and job mobility was possible, so faculty achieved satisfactory employment.

As the faculty job market becomes more static, the inherently inappropriate character of the academic reward system for most faculty becomes increasingly evident. Yet there seems to be no movement toward changing the reward structure in any basic way. The traditional values of the academic model continue to dominate the profession.

# Faculty Autonomy

The academic profession gained new stature during the 1960's. Professional prestige grew as scholars assumed more influence over areas for which they claimed expertise: academic standards and procedures for undergraduate and graduate education and terms and conditions of faculty employment. These gains furthered their concept of professionalism: autonomy in setting standards of performance; and autonomy in regulating terms and conditions of employment.

Only ten years later, these achievements are being eroded by new conditions in higher education. Administrators are assuming a more active role in academic decisionmaking both on campus and in central system offices. Their greater role diminishes academics' influence on campus affairs. In addition, college and university administrators are relying more on nontenure-track positions to fill their faculty ranks. Faculty who take these positions do not usually participate in departmental or campus-wide discussions on acadamic affairs, nor do they have a long-range interest in the institution's development. Increasing use of these appointments require a corresponding decrease in the number of tenure-track and tenured faculty, which may diminish their effectiveness on campus.

To summarize, centralized decisionmaking and "irregular" faculty appointments may impair faculty autonomy. They also widen the gap between current practices in higher education and the academic model's version of faculty life. In one reaction to these developments, many academics have to turned to collective bargaining to express their dissatisfaction over their lack of professional autonomy.

*Centralized Decisionmaking*

Ideally, faculty exercise their influence in academic affairs through departmental and campus-wide governance structures, such as the academic senate. These structures have not always been effective, but recent events in higher education have further reduced faculty's potential for influencing academic decisions. Three events have contributed to more centralized decisionmaking: (1) increases in campus size and in the number of colleges and universities; (2) growing financial problems; and (3) federal regulations for higher education.

First, higher education's rapid growth in the 1960's elevated faculty

to new positions of influence. Paradoxically, this growth has also produced new administrative structures that shift the locus of decision-making away from faculty ranks to higher administrative levels. Garbarino and Aussieker (1975) report on structural changes that occurred from academic years 1962-63 to 1970-71. During this period, comprehensive systems, which include both two- and four-year institutions, increased from six to 12 systems, but the number of institutions involved grew from 44 to 139, while campuses increased from 56 to 167; at the same time, segmented systems (two- or four-year institutions exclusively) grew from six institutions with seven campuses to 135 institutions, including 196 campuses; finally, main-branch institutions, which are institutions having direct administrative control over subordinate campuses, declined from 78 institutions with 225 campuses to 74 institutions with 235 campuses. In these systems, some main-campus institutions may have been merged into multi- or segmented systems, while single campuses became multicampus institutions. These developments affect faculty participation in governance at the campus and system levels. Garbarino and Aussieker comment that:

> The major change . . . is likely to be felt in the larger administrative units of colleges, schools and, most important, at the campus level. Increases in the size of the campus means a proliferation of committees and a need for coordination and consultation that results in delay, compromise and referrals before an action can be taken (p. 10).

At multicampuses and multiinstitutional systems the problems are compounded because the campus governance structures have to be replicated at the central administrative level. Decisionmaking is further removed from the individual faculty member (Garbarino and Aussieker 1978, p. 1[illegible]).

Other factors may mitigate the influence of centralized decision-making processes. Baldridge et al. observe that faculty at large, elite, research-oriented, public and private multiuniversities have developed a compromise with administrators on academic decisions. These groups have a relationship of "federated professionalism" that evolved because of the complexity of institutional operations. Under this relationship:

> The faculties demand and receive control over departments and academic programs; the administrations exercise strong leadership in long-

* See also Lee and Bowen 1975.

> range planning, budgeting and institutional programming. . . . There is . . . a precarious balance of power between the highly influential faculties and the powerful administrators (p. 89).

Baldridge et al. find that influential faculty coupled with the large size and complexity of these institutions encourages the development of "strong departmental professional enclaves" that are less subject to outside influences (p. 91).

Unlike their more prestigious colleagues, faculty at public comprehensives and public colleges do not have as much autonomy in their professional lives. These faculty represent the median in faculty autonomy nationwide:

> Their administrators are very strong and external environmental forces penetrate to a larger degree. As a consequence, faculty influence is considerably weakened, although the departments certainly maintain some influence (Baldridge et al., p. 93).

Faculty autonomy at less prestigious institutions is even further reduced.

Second, higher education's financial problems have extended administrators' influence in academic affairs into several areas: (1) faculty retrenchment and layoffs; (2) academic planning; and (3) departmental budgets. Lee and Bowen (1975) note that financial exigency involves central administrators in decisions on academic personnel. Administrators determine when financial exigency occurs and set policies for layoffs. Lee and Bowen believe that equity requires central administrative officers to establish a systemwide uniform policy for layoffs, as the University of Wisconsin system did during 1973-1974. Included in Wisconsin's policy was a definition of financial exigency and procedures for layoffs. Under this plan, more than 500 probationary faculty contracts were not renewed, and 88 tenured faculty or staff were laid off.

Academic program planning and budgeting processes have also multiplied in recent years as a result of financial pressures. In multicampus systems, academic plans have become "working documents that explore options and alternatives among campuses on the basis of realistic demographic and fiscal projections, and are subject to continuing analysis and revision" (Lee and Bowen 1975, p. 134). Procedures for proposing and establishing new academic programs have become exceedingly complicated, review of existing programs is more stringent, and administrative oversight is greater overall.

Academic departments also feel the constraints of financial problems. Their flexibility in budgeting has been reduced. Baldridge

observes that when finances were adequate, administrators often gave departments their annual budgets with standard increases. Departments determined how their funds were to be allocated. Under current financial conditions, departments are more likely to get a budget with few, if any, increases. Furthermore, administrators may dictate to departments how the money is to be spent.

Third, governmental rules and regulations have accelerated the process of centralization on many campuses. Bowker (1977) observes that federal regulations are a direct cause of centralization at the University of California at Berkeley. To implement these regulations, central administration offices were established to set uniform procedures for compliance in all units of the university. Faculty find that these procedures reduce their ability to make independent judgments on academic and personnel matters:

> Autonomy is reduced by the degree of documentation required to transfer funds or to justify equipment purchases on contacts and grants. Autonomy is particularly lost in affirmative action matters and is eroded for the institution when federal funds are made contingent upon compliance. . . . *When individual and institutional priorities are even partially determined elsewhere, autonomy is lost* (emphasis added) (Bowker 1977, p. 413).

Overall, academics argue that the loss of their power to influence academic decisions affects their attitudes toward their profession:

> a delocalized college [one whose decisions are affected by outside influences] is significantly less hospitable to the profession. The shift of effective power from within to without the institution makes many academic persons feel they are dominated by external forces that professional manners are too tame to influence and professional committtees too weak to reach (Metzger 1975, p. 35.

*"Irregular" Faculty Positions*

Long-range enrollment trends may substantially alter traditional faculty employment policies and practices. Academic planners know that declines in the 18-to-22-year-old college-going age cohort mean that they will need significantly fewer new faculty employees for the rest of the century; but 1970's student enrollment levels require them to employ faculty in numbers that are expected to exceed their requirements later. Under these conditions, the traditional faculty employment procedure—a probationary period of employment leading to consideration for tenure—seems inappropriate because openings for tenured positions will not be available.

In a 1977 survey of nontenure-track policies and practices ("On

Full-Time . . ."), the American Association of University Professors found that such appointments were on the rise. "Nontenured track appointments" are, as the phrase suggests, conditional faculty positions that do not grant tenure and confer no expectation of a tenured appointment. The AAUP identifies three categories of nontenure-track appointments: (1) indefinitely renewable appointments; (2) "limited renewable appointments;" and (3) "folding chair" appointments, which are initial, two- to three-year appointments that will not be renewed (p. 268).

Administrators attributed the increase in nontenure-track positions to shifts in student enrollments. For example, a large midwestern public institution decides whether to designate a position "tenure track" or "temporary" based on "departmental enrollment figures and tenure density" (p. 268). Those who receive a temporary position get a one-year contract, and their employment is limited to no more than four additional years.

The AAUP investigators argue that several problems attend the use of these appointments. First, faculty employed under these conditions face considerable uncertainty about the direction of their careers. Unlike probationary faculty, these academics do not get adequate notice of nonrenewal; their contracts simply expire. Alternatively, they may have very limited notice about a contract renewal. Secondly, nontenure-track faculty feel alienated from their regularly-appointed colleagues. Nontenure-track faculty are not expected to do research; they do not serve on department committees, and are not even asked to participate in department meetings. Further, they are socially isolated from regular faculty who are unwilling to invest their energies in faculty they know will leave. Third, the AAUP investigators believe that the growing reliance on these irregular appointments threatens the traditional system of academic freedom and tenure. Faculty employed without expectation of tenure, such as those on unlimited renewable appointments, are likely to be constrained in their scholarly activities for fear of offending their employer. In addition, the increase in such appointments may ease the way for a phasing-out of the tenure system. Administrators already use the spectre of financial pressures and enrollment patterns to support their use of nontenured appointments for basic college courses, so, the argument goes, more extended use of these appointments can be similarly justified. Moreover, the investigators contend that growth in nontenured positions with a corresponding reduction in tenured appointments also threatens academic freedom: "the major protection for the nontenured teacher is an independent and strong,

and therefore of necessity large, group of tenured colleagues" ("On Full-time. . ." 1978, p. 272).

From an administration's perspective, these irregular appointments may serve as a practical response to problems of financial constraints and student needs. In the University of Wisconsin system, for example, campuses use "staff" appointments to respond to the requirements of system funding. A 1976 budget paper states:

> A majority (75%) of funds provided by the State to the University System or by the Board of Regents and Central Administration to the Institutions should be on a *fixed term basis to ensure sufficient budget and staffing liquidity to adjust to actual enrollment experience in an uncertain period* ("1977-1979 Biennial Operating Budget" 1976, p. 10).

Interestingly, administrators seem to prefer nontenure-track appointments over part-time employment to cope with current enrollment trends. For higher education as a whole, part-time faculty will experience a limited surge in growth compared to full-time faculty: from 1975 to 1985, the number of part-time faculty will increase by little more than 5 percent, from 233,000 to 245,000; in the same period, full-time faculty will increase by only 3.2 percent. Both groups will experience some decline in growth after 1980, but the number of part-time faculty will peak earlier and decline sooner than full-time faculty (Leslie 1978).

Some sectors of the academic community are increasing their use of part-time employees more than others. The number of part-timers in community colleges, which have always employed the largest number of part-timers, is growing at a rate that is almost three times greater than the national aggregate. Community colleges registered an increase of .026 compared to an average of about .008 for all institutions between 1975 and 1976 (Leslie 1978). Other institutional types are increasing their use of part-timers at a slower rate. Between 1973 and 1976, master's degree-granting institutions had increased their part-time scientific faculty to 20.5 percent of their total from 13.4 percent. The same cohort increased from 15.4 percent at baccalaureate institutions in 1971 to 18.2 percent in 1976. But doctoral institutions are decreasing their use of part-timers: from 20 percent of all scientific faculty in 1965 to 17.3 percent in 1976.

*Collective Bargaining*

Since autonomy is closely associated with the concept of the academic profession, loss of autonomy may be viewed as a process of

"deprofessionalization." Alternatively, autonomy may never have been realized. For many faculty members these situations have developed, and they are in direct contrast to their understanding of what their academic careers should be like. To improve their condition, faculty may opt for collective bargaining. Paradoxically, they may believe that this "working-class" form of employee relations will restore necessary independence to their professional lives.

Faculty unionism has steadily been gaining ground since the late 1960's. Ladd and Lipset's (1978) survey shows growth in faculty support from 59 percent of all faculty in 1969 to 69 percent in 1975; support for strike action has also increased from 47 percent to 66 percent during the same interval. The location of collective bargaining units supports the thesis that professional interests are involved in the decision to choose unionism. Those faculty supporting unions have the least professional status and thus the most to gain from a new form of faculty influence. Of the 294 unionized institutions in January 1976, nearly 75 percent were two-year colleges, and most unionized four-year institutions were at the low range of institutional prestige. In multicampus units, such as the City University of New York, the greatest support for collective bargaining has come from the community colleges (Ladd and Lipset 1978). In contrast, faculty at more prestigious schools show significantly less interest in unionization because they function less as employees and more as autonomous professionals who have decisionmaking powers (Ladd and Lipset 1978).

Several higher education analysts confirm that autonomy, or lack of it, is a major factor in faculty support of unionism (Aussieker and Garbarino 1975; Baldridge 1978; Lee 1978). Baldridge, for example, observes:

> the movement toward collective bargaining in the first place partly reflects faculty anxiety over the erosion of local autonomy by statewide bonds and coordinating agencies. Many faculty have embraced collective bargaining as a weapon to use against economy-minded legislators and trustees who insist upon cost reductions and improved accountability (Baldridge et al. 1978, p. 157).

On the whole, unionized faculty have enhanced their autonomy.* Generally, unions have empowered faculty who had no autonomy, or they have formalized and clarified areas of faculty responsibility in situations where faculty did have some decisionmaking authority prior to unionization. More specifically, unionized faculty have gained

* The following discussion is based on Lee's (1978) synthesis of the literature on faculty collective bargaining.

ground in several areas of academic decisionmaking. Faculty senates have become strengthened on many campuses, particularly where the senate was at least ten years old before unionization. These senates are likely to deal decisively with curricular and program decisions. In addition, some studies indicate that senates have become more responsive to campus issues to protect themselves against possible incursions by the unions. Under union contracts senates depend on unions' tolerance for their continued existence. To date, however, only a few senates have been dissolved.

Departmental influence also appears to have improved. Lee notes that such departments make curricular decisions and usually evaluate their colleagues for promotion and tenure. They also have won or kept their authority to make hiring decisions, but they have less autonomy in deciding on faculty promotions. Union contracts also give more weight to departmental recommendations on governance matters if the departmental committees have contractual standing. Similarly, faculty have either retained their autonomy or enhanced it in the case of personnel decisions under union contracts: *Evaluation* — Contracts vary in thier focus on faculty evaluation, ranging from specific evaluation standards to incorporation by reference of pre-union evaluative criteria. In some instances, administrative efforts to impose evaluation criteria caused faculty to unionize. *Promotion* — Survey results suggest that "promotion policies were more systematic and formalized as a result of unionization," (which is a gain for faculties that complained of ambiguity in promotion standards before unionization) (Lee 1978, p. 31). In addition, contractual grievance procedures have influenced promotion and tenure. Administrators have assumed more oversight responsibility for promotion decisions since they are legally responsible for them. *Tenure* — Early fears that unionization would jeopardize the tenure system have not been realized. More than 70 percent of all faculty union contracts with four-year institutions have specific tenure policies and procedures. But tenure provisions may not protect faculty in times of financial exigency and retrenchment. *Grievance and Arbitration* — As a result of contractual grievance mechanisms, campus procedures for evaluation, promotion, and tenure have become formalized and uniform. Due process is required for all personnel decisions; and decisions are likely to be made more quickly because policy guidelines are in place. "The decisionmaking criteria that have evolved as a result of the requirements of due process are seen as more consistent and fairer than evaluative criteria that were used prior to unionization" (Lee 1978, p. 38).

*Summary*

During its 1960's expansion, the higher education community relied on faculty values and judgments to develop a contemporary higher education system. In this era, faculty at the most prestigious levels realized independence in personnel and academic decisionmaking. Their careers served as models for the academic profession.

More recently, however, faculty have not profitted from the growth of the 1960's. Instead, they perceive a loss of professional autonomy that may be traced to earlier growth. First, higher education's expansion required better management, which meant more administrative oversight and more centralization in academic decisionmaking. Second, higher education's expansion outdistanced its financial resources. The resulting financial difficulties have restricted and, in some cases, reduced faculty's independence in academic affairs. At the same time, these financial problems, when coupled with current and projected enrollments, have affected the tenure system of employment. In the view of some observers, the inroads made on traditional academic employment practices may impair academic independence. And third, the growth of the higher education industry has also resulted in greater federal oversight of academic affairs. Consequently, the academic community as a whole fears that it has sacrificed some necessary independence or flexibility in its management of its internal affairs.

This turnaround in faculty autonomy is reflected in the advances made by collective bargaining in colleges and universities. Many observers believe faculty have resorted to collective bargaining to recoup some professional autonomy, or to gain autonomy they never have had but believe is due them. Faculty unions have showed steady growth since the late 1960's. More significantly, faculty are increasingly disposed to consider favorably the prospect of unionization. Paradoxically, as professional independence decreases, faculty may turn to unionization, a "working-class" strategy, to have an effective voice in academic decisionmaking.

It seems clear, however, that faculty will in fact have a less influential voice in academic decisionmaking for the foreseeable future. Conditions beyond their individual and collective control will continue to influence the course of academic affairs: the managerial imperative in academic life; reduced financial flexibility; demographics; and, government oversight.

# Conclusions

The academic model has guided the training and established professional standards for currently employed academics. With the grip this model has on the profession, it is difficult to make any changes in the lives of academics that will make their careers more congruent with new realities in higher education or with their own real interests. The academic model is a combination of professional values that emerged during the late nineteenth century—importance of research, peer judgment, disciplinary orientation--and development of these values and new additions to the model that occured during the 1960's. During this period of unparalleled expansion, faculty realized professional gains: social prestige, greater job mobility, more self-regulation, and greater influence in academic governance.

This model served academics satisfactorily during a period of expanding opportunity and seemingly unlimited resources. Inherent conflicts between the academic ideal and faculty's working lives were largely overlooked. For example, the importance of research as the base for career rewards became less important in this period because opportunities for promotion and job changes were so widely available. Faculty who were not heavily involved in research still could develop satisfying careers.

This report has indicated how changing conditions in higher education expose the conflicts in the academic profession and have created a situation that calls for a reevaluation of the academic model. What follows is a review of the problems the academic profession faces.

- *Mobility*: College faculty have used job mobility as a strategy for obtaining job satisfaction, *e.g.* acceptable career rewards, and stimulating academic interests. Further, both faculty and administration have relied on the continuing flow of new academics into departments to maintain academic vitality. Enrollment projections and faculty age profiles spell the end of this strategy as an effective means for enhancing academic life: few job vacancies will become available for the next fifteen years. Under these circumstances, the higher education community needs to find new methods to maintain academic vitality.

- *Reward Systems*: It is axiomatic that the academic reward system is incongruent with the real activities and interests of most faculty and

the purposes of most institutions. Reflecting the values of the academic model, the reward system gives greater weight to research than any other faculty activity in determining career rewards. Always a reason for dissatisfaction in the academic profession, this system becomes more exacerbating as other sources of job satisfaction are closed off.

• *Autonomy*: Conditions of expansion during the 1960's that created a climate for faculty authority and independence have also contributed to loss of faculty autonomy during the 1970's. Centralized decisionmaking is increasing because of the need for more efficient management of scarce resources and in response to more government regulations. Greater reliance on "irregular" faculty appointments may also diminish the influence of probationary and tenured faculty in academic decisionmaking.

There seems little cause for optimism given this somewhat dispiriting portrait of the academic profession and the hard facts about prospects for higher education. More importantly, however, faculty gloom seems to result from the dissonance in their lives between their expectations for their academic careers and their actual career paths. For most academics, higher education no longer promises the excitement of prestigious careers, rapid advancement, and professional prerogatives that it did through the 1960's. What seems called for is a new model of the academic profession that can reconcile academic values, such as the pursuit of knowledge, with the changing environment in higher education and faculty's real career profile.

# Bibliography

The ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education abstracts and indexes the current literature on higher education for the National Institute of Education's monthly bibliographic journal *Resources in Education (RIE)*. Most of these publications are available through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Ordering number and price for publications cited in this bibliography that are available from EDRS have been included at the end of each citation. Readers who wish to order a publication should write to the ERIC Document Reproduction Service, Post Office Box 190, Arlington, Virginia 22210. When ordering, please specify the document number. Unless otherwise noted, documents are available in both microfiche (MF) and hard/photocopy (HC).


"Academic Salaries and the Cost of Living;" *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, February 5, 1979, p. 2.

American Association of University Professors. "Academic Freedom and Tenure, 1940 Statement of Principles and 1970 Interpretive Comments," in *AAUP Policy Documents and Reports*. Washington, D.C.: AAUP 1977. ED 144 475. MF—$0.98; HC—$2.54.

Anderson, John W.; Kelly, Edward F.; Munz, David C.; Wergin, John F.; Wuest, Francis J. *An Evaluation of the Small College Consortium, 1977-78. A Title III Project*. Part II: Case Studies. June 1978. ED 145 799. MF—$0.98; HC—$2.54.

Atkinson, Richard. "Demographics, Dollars, and Difficulties in Graduate Education. Proposed Remarks." University of Iowa, Ames, November 1976.

Baldridge, J. Victor; Curtis, David V.; Ecker, George; Riley, Gary L. *Policymaking and Effective Leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1978.

Baratz, Morton S. "Making Room for Junior Scholars." *Academe* 12 (June 1978): n.p.n.

———. Conversation with author, September 1, 1978b.

Bess, James L. "Organizational Implications of Faculty Role/Activity Preferences." Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association, April 1976. ED 134 089. MF-$0.98; HC-$5.33.

Blackburn, Robert T. "Part-Time Faculty and the Production of Knowledge," in *New Directions for Institutional Research*. Em-

ploying Part-Time Faculty, edited by David W. Leslie. Number 18, Summer 1978.

Blau, Peter M. *The Organization of Academic Work.* New York: John Wiley, 1973.

Bowker, Albert H. *The Impact of Federal Regulations on the University of California.* An Institutional Self-Study for the Sloan Commission on Government and Higher Education. Berkeley: University of California, September 1977.

Caplow, Theodore; McGee, Reece J. *The Academic Marketplace.* New York: Basic Books, 1958.

Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. *The More Effective Use of Resources. An Imperative for Higher Education.* New York: McGraw Hill, June 1972.

*Careers in Business. Campus to Corporation.* Albany: State University of New York, 1978.

Carter, Lisle C., Jr. "Continued Viability of Universities as Centers for Basic Research." Report of Task Group #1. National Science Foundation Advisory Council. October 20, 1978. HE 010 702 (RIE May 1978). MF-$0.98; HC-$2.54.

Cartter, Allan M. *Ph.D.'s and the Academic Labor Market.* New York: McGraw-Hill, 1976.

Cheit, Earl F. *The New Depression in Higher Education. A Study of the Financial Conditions at 41 Colleges and Universities.* New York: McGraw-Hill, 1971.

Cohen, Michael D., and March, James G. *Leadership and Ambiguity. The American College President. A General Report Prepared for the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education.* New York: McGraw-Hill, 1974.

Dressel, Paul L., and Thompson, Mary Magdala. *A Degree for College Teachers. The Doctor of Arts.* New York: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1977.

Drucker, Peter F. "The Professor as Featherbedder." *The Chronicle of Higher Education,* January 1977, p. 24.

Duryea, E.D. "Evolution of University Organization," in *The University as an Organization,* edited by James A. Perkins. A Report for the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1973.

Fernandez, Luis. *U.S. Faculty After the Boom: Demographic Projections to 2000.* A report for the Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education. Project on Quantitative Policy Analysis Models of Demand and Supply in Higher Education, Technical Report No. 4, April 1978.

Fincher, Cameron et al. *The Closing System of Academic Employment.* Atlanta: Southern Regional Education Board, 1978. HE 010 499 (RIE Feb 1979). MF-$0.98; HC-$5.33.

Garbarino, Joseph W. and Aussieker, Bill. *Faculty Bargaining, Change and Conflict.* A Report Prepared for the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education and the Ford Foundation. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1975.

Glenny, Lyman A. et al. *Presidents Confront Reality. From Edifice Complex to University Without Walls.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1976.

Grant, W. Vance, and Lind, C. George. *Digest of Education Statistics 1977-78.* Washington Printing Office, 1978.

Halstead, D. Kent. *Higher Education Prices and Price Indexes.* Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1975 and 1977 supplement. ED 145 784. MF-$0.98; HC-$3.98.

Jencks, Christopher, and Riesman, David. *The Academic Revolution.* Garden City, N.Y.: Anchor Books, 1969.

Jonsen, Richard W. *Small Liberal Arts Colleges: Diversity at the Crossroads.* AAHE/ERIC Higher Education Research Report No. 4. Washington, D.C.: AAHE, 1978. ED 154 680. MF-$0.98; HC-$3.98.

Kanter, Rosabeth Moss. *Men and Women of the Corporation.* New York: Basic Books, 1977.

Kuh, Charlotte V. "Time to Tenure and The Market fo Ph.D.'s in U.S. Higher Education." Cambridge: Harvard Graduate School of Education, 1978.

Ladd, Everett, Carll, Jr., and Lipset, Seymour Martin. *Final Report. Survey of the Social, Political, and Educational Perspectives of American College and University Faculty.* Volumes I and II. National Institute of Education Grant, Project No. 3-3053. Storrs, Conn.: University of Connecticut [1978]. HE 008 622. ED 135 278. MF-$0.96; HC-$24.88.

———. "The Faculty Mood: Pessimism is Predominant," *The Chronicle of Higher Education,* October 3, 1977, p. 1.

Lee, Barbara A. *Collective Bargaining in Four-Year Colleges: Impact on Institutional Practices.* AAHE/ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education Research Report No. 5. Washington, D.C.: AAHE, 1978. HE 010 516 (April RIE). MF-$0.98; HC-$5.15.

Lee, Eugene C., and Bowen, Frank M. *Managing Multicampus Systems. Effective Administration in an Unsteady State.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1975.

Leslie, David W. "The Part-Time Faculty Labor Force," in *New Di-*

*rections for Institutional Research. Employing Part-Time Faculty,* edited by David Leslie. Number 18, Summer 1978.

Lewis, Lionel S., and Ryan, Michael N. "The American Professoriate and the Movement Toward Unionization," *Higher Education* 6 (May 1977): 139-164.

Light, D. W., Jr., and Mardsen, Corl, T. C. *The Impact of the Academic Revolution on Faculty Careers.* ERIC Research Report No. 10. Washington, D.C.: AAHE, 1972. ED 072 758. MF-$0.98; HC-$5.33.

Linnell, Robert H. "Academic Compensation and Supplemental Income: Ethical and Economic Issues and Recommendations for Changes." Working Title of Monograph to be published in Fall 1979. Study supported by the Carnegie Corporation of New York.

Linney, Thomas H. "Alternatives to Tenure." AAHE-ERIC/Higher Education Research Currents. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education, March 1979. HE 010 995, (June 1979 RIE). MF-$0.98; HC-$2.15.

Lipset, Seymour Martin, and Ladd, Everett Carll. "The Changing Social Origins of American Academics." *Qualitative and Quantitative Social Research.* Papers in Honor of Paul F. Lazarsfeld (edited by Mertins, Robert K.; Coleman, James S.; and Rossi, Peter H.) New York: The Free Press 1979.

Mason, Henry L. *College and University Government. A. Handbook of Principle and Practice.* New Orleans: Tulane University, 1972.

Metzger, Walter P. "The Academic Profession in 'Hard Times'" *Daedalus* 104: (Winter 1975): 25-44.

Millett, John D. "Higher Education Management Versus Business Management." *Educational Record* 56 (Fall 1975): 221-225.

"1977-1979 Biennial Operating Budget." Policy Paper #1.1. University of Wisconsin System. September 1976, p. 10.

"On Full-Time Non-Tenure-Track Appointments." *AAUP Bulletin* 64 (September 1978): 267-273.

O'Toole, James. "Tenure. A Conscientious Objection." *Change* 10 (June-July 1978): 24-31.

Radner, Roy; Kuh, Charlotte V. *Preserving A Lost Generation; Policies to Assure a Steady Flow of Young Scholars Until the Year 2000. Report and Recommendations. Projection on Quantitative Policy Analysis Models of Demand and Supply in Higher Education.* Berkeley: Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education, October 1978.

Scully, Malcolm G. " 'Academic Musical Chairs': Many Say the Game's

Ending." *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. October 23, 1978, p. 1.

———. "Mobilizing a Discipline to Reward Its Teachers." *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. October 16, 1978b, p. 14.

Shulman, Carol Herrnstadt. *Enrollment Trends in Higher Education*. AAHE ERIC/Higher Education Reseorch Report No. 6. Washington, D.C.: AAHE, 1976. ED 129-199. HF-$0.98; HC-$3.98.

Showalter, Dennis. "Publication and Stagnation in the Liberal Arts College." *Educational Record* 59 (Spring 1978): 166-172.

Solmon, Lewis C. "Turnover of Senior Faculty in Departments of Social and Physical Science and Engineering." *Rsearch in Higher Education* 8 (1978): 343-355.

———; Ochsner, Nancy L.; and Hurwicz, Margo-Lea. "Jobs for Humanists." *Change* 10 (June/July 1978): 56-57.

Solomon, Eric. "Whatever Happened to the Teachers of '65," *Mother Jones* (Sept./Oct. 1978): 62-66.

Trivett, David A. *Compensation in Higher Education*. ERIC/Higher Education Research Currents. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education, February-March 1978. ED 150 914. MF-$0.98; HC-$2.15.

Van Alstyne, William W. "Tenure. A Conscientious Objection," *Change* (October 1974): 44-47.

Wilson, Logan. *The Academic Man. A Study in the Sociology of the Profession*. New York: Octagon Books. Inc., 1949. Reprinted 1964.

Yankelovich, Daniel. "The New Psychological Contracts at Work." *Psychology Today* (May 1978): 46-50.